arXiv:1406.3698v2 [math.NT] 16 Jan 2016

On an asymptotic behavior of the divisor function $\tau(n)$

Tigran Hakobyan

Abstract

For $\mu > 0$ we study an asymptotic behavior of the sequence defined as

$$T_n(\mu) = \frac{max_{1\leq m\leq n^{\frac{1}{\mu}}}\{\tau(n+m)\}}{\tau(n)},\ n = 1, 2, ...$$

where $\tau(n)$ denotes the number of natural divisors of the given $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The motivation of this observation is to explore whether τ function oscillates rapidly in small neighborhoods of natural numbers.

Introduction

Recall that the function $\tau(n)$ defined as the number of positive divisors of the given positive integer n has many investigated asymptotic properties and some of them are presented below.

1. $\forall \epsilon > 0\ \tau(n) = o(n^{\epsilon})$.[1]

2. $\forall \epsilon > 0\ \exists$ infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

   $$\tau(n) > 2^{(1-\epsilon)\frac{\ln(n)}{\ln(\ln(n))}}$$

   and

   $$\tau(n) < 2^{(1+\epsilon)\frac{\ln(n)}{\ln(\ln(n))}}$$

   holds for sufficiently large n. (Vigert, 1907)

3. $$\sum_{k=1}^{n}\tau(k) = \sum_{k=1}^{n}[\frac{n}{k}] = n\ln(n) + (2\gamma - 1)n + O(n^{\frac{13}{40}+\epsilon}), \forall \epsilon > 0$$

   where γ is the Euler's constant.[1]

4. Worth mentioning the result in [5] concerning Karatsuba's problem on determining the asymptotic behavior of the sum

   $$S_a(x) = \sum_{n\leq x}\frac{\tau(n)}{\tau(n+a)}$$

   stated in 2004 which was estimated by M.A. Korolev in 2010.

1 Basic assertions

For $\mu > 0$ consider the sequence

$$T_n(\mu) = \frac{max_{1\leq m\leq n^{\frac{1}{\mu}}}\{\tau(n+m)\}}{\tau(n)},\ n = 1, 2, ...$$

Let us assume that (n_k) is a sequence of positive integers such that $n_k = {p_k}^{j_k}$ where p_k is prime and $j_k \in \mathbb{N}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition **1.1.**

$$\theta = \inf\{\lambda > 0 | \sum_{k=1}^{N} \tau(k) = N\ln(N) + (2\gamma - 1)N + O(N^{\lambda+\epsilon}), \forall\epsilon > 0\}.$$

where γ is the Euler's constant.

The main results of this paper are the following theorems.

Theorem **1.1.** *If $\mu > 0$, then $T_{n_k}(\mu) \to \infty$, as $j_k \to \infty$.*

Theorem **1.2.** *If $1 \leq \mu < \theta^{-1}$, then $T_{n_k}(\mu) \to \infty$, as $n_k \to \infty$.*

2 Preliminary statements

Obviously we may assume that $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$.
Indeed, if theorem 1 holds for some $\mu_0 > 0$ then it holds for any $0 < \mu < \mu_0$. On the other hand theorem 2 follows from theorem 1 as we will see later.

Now we fix $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu \geq 2$ and suppose that $k = \mu m$ where $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Definition **2.1.**

$$\nu_p(n) = \max\{k \geq 0 : p^k | n\};$$
$$\Delta(n) = \sum_{\{p:p|n\}} \nu_p(n), n > 1,$$

and

$$\Delta(1) = 0.$$

Observe that using multiplicativity property of τ we will get

$$\tau(p^k + p^s) = \tau(p^s)\tau(p^{k-s} + 1) = (s + 1)\tau(p^{k-s} + 1)$$

for any $s \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k - 1\}$ and prime number p.

On the other hand

$$\Delta(mn) = \Delta(m) + \Delta(n)$$

and consequently $\Delta(n^k) = k\Delta(n)$ for every $m, n, k \in \mathbb{N}$.

LEMMA **2.1.** *If $(k-s)$ is odd then*

$$\tau(p^{k-s}+1) \geq \tau(k-s) \geq \Delta(k-s).$$

Proof. Indeed, if a is odd and $a \vdots b$ then

$$(m^a+1) \vdots (m^b+1)$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and hence

$$\tau(m^a+1) \geq \tau(a).$$

The latter inequality follows from

$$\tau(n) = \prod_{\{p:p|n\}} (1+\nu_p(n)) > \sum_{\{p:p|n\}} \nu_p(n) = \Delta(n)$$

□

.

DEFINITION **2.2.** *Now define*

$$A(k) = \sum_{s=1}^{m} (s+1)\Delta(k-s)$$

and

$$A'(k) = \prod_{s=1}^{m} (k-s)^{s+1}.$$

So

$$A'(k) = \prod_{s=1}^{m} (\mu m - s)^{s+1} = \frac{(\mu m-1)!}{((\mu-1)m-1)!} \prod_{s=1}^{m} \frac{(\mu m-s)!}{((\mu-1)m-1)!}.$$

Notice that

$$A(k) = \Delta(A'(k))$$

So

$$A(k) = \Delta(\frac{(\mu m-1)!}{((\mu-1)m-1)!} \prod_{s=1}^{m} \frac{(\mu m-s)!}{((\mu-1)m-1)!}) =$$

$$= \Delta(\frac{(\mu m-1)!}{((\mu-1)m-1)!}) + \Delta(\prod_{s=1}^{m} \frac{(\mu m-s)!}{((\mu-1)m-1)!})$$

DEFINITION **2.3.** *Define*

$$B(k) = \Delta(\frac{(\mu m-1)!}{((\mu-1)m-1)!})$$

and

$$C(k) = \Delta(\prod_{s=1}^{m} \frac{(\mu m-s)!}{((\mu-1)m-1)!})$$

So

$$A(k) = B(k) + C(k)$$

.

LEMMA **2.2.** *There is some constant $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$\Delta(k!) \leq \gamma k \ln(\ln(k))$$

holds for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By the famous identity $\nu_p(n!) = \sum_{s=1}^{\infty}[\frac{n}{p^s}]$ (henceforth $[x]$ stands for integer part of $x \in R$) we obtain that

$$\Delta(k!) = \sum_{p\leq k} \nu_p(k!) = \sum_{p\leq k}\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}[\frac{k}{p^s}] < \sum_{p\leq k}\frac{k}{p-1} =$$

$$= k(\sum_{p\leq k}\frac{1}{p} + \sum_{p\leq k}\frac{1}{p(p-1)}) < k(\sum_{p\leq k}\frac{1}{p} + \epsilon) <$$

$$< k(\ln(\ln(k)) + \delta) < \gamma k \ln(ln(k))$$

where $\epsilon = \sum_p \frac{1}{p(p-1)} > 0$ and $\delta, \gamma > 0$ .The lemma is proved. □

LEMMA **2.3.** *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$A(k) \geq cm^2 \ln(ln(m))$$

for all $m \geq 2, m \in \mathbb{N}$.(recall that $k = \mu m$)

Proof. Notice that $A(k) = B(k)+C(k)$ and $B(k) = O(m\ln(\ln(m))) = o(m^2\ln(\ln(m)))$ by lemma 1. Now we estimate $C(k)$.

$$C(k) = \sum_{l=(\mu-1)m}^{\mu m-1}\sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}(\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}[\frac{l}{p^s}] - \sum_{s=1}^{\infty}[\frac{(\mu-1)m-1}{p^s}])) \geq$$

$$\geq \sum_{l=(\mu-1)m}^{\mu m-1}\sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}(\sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}(\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}[\frac{l-(\mu-1)m+1}{p^s}])).$$

Furthermore

$$\nu_p(n!) = \sum_{1\leq s\leq [\log_p(n)]}[\frac{n}{p^s}] > \frac{n}{p}(1 + \frac{1}{p} + \ldots + \frac{1}{p^{[\log_p(n)]-1}}) - [\log_p(n)] \geq$$

$$\geq \frac{n-p}{p-1} - \log_p(n) = \frac{n-1}{p-1} - \log_p(np).$$

Thus

$$C(k) \geq \sum_{l=(\mu-1)m}^{\mu m-1}(\sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}(\frac{l-(\mu-1)m}{p-1} - \log_p((l-(\mu-1)m+1)p))) =$$

$$= \sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}(\frac{1}{p-1}+\frac{2}{p-1}+\ldots+\frac{m-1}{p-1}-\log_p(2p\cdot 3p\cdot\ldots\cdot mp))=$$

$$=\frac{m(m-1)}{2}\sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}\frac{1}{p-1}-(m-1)\pi(\mu m-1)-\sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}\log_p(m!)$$

Definition **2.4.**

$$X(m)=\frac{m(m-1)}{2}\sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}\frac{1}{p-1},$$

$$Y(m)=(m-1)\pi(\mu m-1)$$

and

$$Z(m)=\sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}\log_p(m!)$$

. Recall that the functions $\pi(n), \frac{n}{\ln(n)}$and $Li(n)=\int_2^n\frac{dt}{\ln(t)}$ are equivalent as $n\to\infty$, where
$\pi(n)=card\{1\leq k\leq n|k\ is\ prime\}$ for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$.(see[1])

From

$$\pi(\mu m-1)=O(\frac{m}{\ln(m)})$$

we infer that

$$Y(m)=(m-1)\pi(\mu m-1)=O(\frac{m^2}{\ln(m)})=o(m^2\ln(\ln(m))).$$

On the other hand $Z(m)=\ln(m!)\sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}\frac{1}{\ln(p)}$. Observe that

$$\sum_{p\leq \mu m-1}\frac{1}{\ln(p)}\leq L\sum_{s=2}^{\pi(\mu m-1)}\frac{1}{\ln(s\ln(s))}<L_1\sum_{s=2}^{\pi(\mu m-1)}\frac{1}{\ln(s)}$$

(since there is an $\alpha>0$ such that $p_k>\alpha k\ln(k)$ for every $k\in\mathbb{N}$ where p_k is the k-th prime) and that

$$\sum_{s=2}^{\pi(\mu m-1)}\frac{1}{\ln(s)}\sim\int_2^{\pi(\mu m-1)}\frac{dt}{\ln(t)}\sim\pi(\pi(\mu m-1))\sim$$

$$\sim\frac{\frac{\mu m-1}{\ln(\mu m-1)}}{\ln(\frac{\mu m-1}{\ln(\mu m-1)})}\sim\mu\frac{m}{\ln(m)^2}$$

(We say $f(x)\sim g(x)$ as $x\to\infty$ if there are positive constants α and β such that $\alpha|f(x)|<|g(x)|<\beta|f(x)|$ for all sufficiently large $x\in\mathbb{R}$)

Therefore using Stirling's formula in the form

$$\ln(m!)=O(m\ln(m))$$

we will get that

$$Z(m) = O(\frac{m}{\ln(m)^2}) \cdot O(m\ln(m)) = O(\frac{m^2}{\ln(m)}) = o(m^2\ln(\ln(m))).$$

To estimate $X(m)$ we use the fact that

$$\sum_{\{p\leq n | p \ is \ prime\}} \frac{1}{p} > \ln(\ln(n)) - 1$$

for all $n \geq 2, n \in \mathbb{N}$, which exactly means that for all $c \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, $X(m)$ and consequently $C(k)$ has the property $C(k) \geq cm^2\ln(\ln(m))$ eventually. Hence

$$A(k) = A(\mu m) \geq cm^2\ln(\ln(m))$$

eventually, as desired. □

Thus

$$A(k) = \sum_{s=1}^{m}(s+1)\Delta(k-s) \geq cm^2\ln(\ln(m))$$

for m large enough.

It follows that $\exists s_0 \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ such that

$$(s_0+1)\Delta(k-s_0) \geq c\ mln(\ln(m)).$$

If $(k - s_0)$ is odd then

$$\tau(p^k + p^{s_0}) \geq (s_0+1)\Delta(k-s_0) \geq c\ mln(\ln(m))$$

(see the section "preliminary statements")
hence

$$\frac{\max_{1\leq m\leq \sqrt[\mu]{n}}\tau(n+m)}{\tau(n)} \geq \frac{cm\ln(\ln(m))}{\mu m+1} > \frac{c}{2\mu}\ln(\ln(m))$$

for m large enough.

REMARK **2.1.** *Unfortunately ,it may happen that $(k - s_0)$ is even . To fix this we proceed in the following way .*

DEFINITION **2.5.** *For an arbitrary $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta > 0$ let us define*

$$I(m,\beta) = \sum_{\{1\leq s\leq m | \nu_2(k-s) > \beta ln(ln(m))\}} (s+1)\Delta(k-s).$$

LEMMA **2.4.** *For every $\beta > 0$,*

$$I(m,\beta) = o(m^2\ln(\ln(m)))$$

as $m \to \infty$.

Proof. Suppose $k-s=2^l a$, where a is odd and $l>\beta\ln(\ln(m))$.
So

$$a<\frac{\mu m}{2^{\beta\ln(ln(m))}}$$

.
Define

$$L(m)=\frac{\mu m}{2^{\beta\ln(ln(m))}}=\frac{\mu m}{\ln(m)^{\beta\ln(2)}}.$$

Since

$$(k-s)\in\{(\mu-1)m,(\mu-1)m+1,\ldots,\mu m-1\},$$

one has that for fixed a there is at most one value of l such that

$$2^l a\in\{(\mu-1)m,(\mu-1)m+1,\ldots,\mu m-1\},$$

hence there are at most

$$L^*(m)\leq L(m)$$

summands with

$$\nu_2(k-s)>\beta\ln(\ln(m)).$$

Let us number them ,say

$$s_1,s_2,\ldots,s_{L^*(m)}$$

and write

$$k-s_j=2^{l_j}a_j$$

, where a_j is odd and

$$l_j>\beta\ln(\ln(m))$$

is integer for every $j\in\{1,2,\ldots,L^*(m)\}$.
Observe that

$$\Delta(k-s)=l_j+\Delta(a_j).$$

Hence if we define

$$I\equiv\sum_{j=1}^{L^*(m)}(s_j+1)\Delta(k-s_j)$$

we will get that

$$I=\sum_{j=1}^{L^*(m)}(s_j+1)l_j+\sum_{j=1}^{L^*(m)}(s_j+1)\Delta(a_j).$$

Definition **2.6.** *Let us define*

$$I_1=\sum_{j=1}^{L^*(m)}(s_j+1)l_j$$

and

$$I_2=\sum_{j=1}^{L^*(m)}(s_j+1)\Delta(a_j).$$

Let us estimate I_1.

DEFINITION **2.7.** *Define*

$$T_m = \{[\beta \ln(\ln(m))] + 1, [\beta \ln(\ln(m))] + 2, \dots, [\log_2(\mu m)]\}$$

for m large enough.

It is clear that

$$l_j \in T_m$$

for every

$$j \in \{1, 2, \dots, L^*(m)\}.$$

Let us fix

$$t \in T_m$$

and consider those s for which

$$k - s = 2^t a$$

, where a is odd.
Since a takes values from a progression with difference $d = 2$, it follows that $2^t a$ takes values from a progression with difference $d = 2^{t+1}$.Consequently the corresponding sum

$$S(m,d) = \sum_{\{\nu_2(k-s)=t\}} (k-s) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{\epsilon+1} ((\mu-1)m + ld)$$

where

$$\epsilon d \leq m < (\epsilon+1)d.$$

Hence

$$S(m,d) \leq (\epsilon+1)(\mu-1)m + \frac{\epsilon(\epsilon+1)}{2}d + \{(\mu-1)m + (\epsilon+1)d\} \leq$$

$$\leq (\mu-1)\frac{m^2}{d} + (\mu-1)m + \frac{m}{2}(\epsilon+1) \leq$$

$$\leq (\mu-1)\frac{m^2}{d} + (\mu-1)m + \frac{m}{2}(\frac{m}{d}+1) + \{(\mu-1)m + (\epsilon+1)d\} \leq$$

$$\leq (\mu-1)\frac{m^2}{d} + (\mu-1)m + \frac{m}{2}(\frac{m}{d}+1) + \{(\mu-1)m + (\frac{m}{d}+1)d\} =$$

$$= (\mu - \frac{1}{2})\frac{m^2}{d} + (2\mu - \frac{1}{2})m + d \leq (\mu - \frac{1}{2})\frac{m^2}{d} + (2\mu + \frac{1}{2})m.$$

So

$$\sum_{l_j=t} s_j l_j \leq t((\mu - \frac{1}{2})\frac{m^2}{2^{t+1}} + (2\mu + \frac{1}{2})m)$$

for all $t \in T_m$.
Thereby

$$I_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{L^*(m)} s_j l_j + \sum_{j=1}^{L^*(m)} l_j = \sum_{t \in T_m} \sum_{l_j=t} s_j l_j + \sum_{j=1}^{L^*(m)} l_j \leq$$

$$\leq \sum_{t\in T_m} t((\mu-\frac{1}{2})\frac{m^2}{2^{t+1}}+(2\mu+\frac{1}{2})m)+L(m)\log_2(m)=$$

$$=(\mu-\frac{1}{2})m^2\sum_{t\in T_m}\frac{t}{2^{t+1}}+(2\mu+\frac{1}{2})m\sum_{t\in T_m}t+\frac{\mu m}{\ln(m)^{\beta\ln(2)}}\cdot\log_2(m)\leq$$

$$\leq(\mu-\frac{1}{2})m^2\theta_m+(2\mu+\frac{1}{2})m(\log_2(m)^2)+\frac{\mu m}{\ln(m)^{\beta\ln(2)}}\cdot\log_2 m=$$

$$=o(m^2)=o(m^2\ln(\ln(m)))$$

since $\theta_m=\sum_{t\in T_m}\frac{t}{2^{t+1}}\to 0$.

Let us estimate I_2.

One has that

$$I_2=\sum_{j=1}^{L^*(m)}(s_j+1)\Delta(a_j)\leq\sum_{j=1}^{L^*(m)}(m+1)\Delta(a_j)\leq(m+1)\sum_{j=1}^{[L(m)]}\Delta(j)\leq$$

$$\leq\gamma(m+1)L(m)\ln(\ln(L(m)))$$

by Lemma 1 and the fact that $a_j\leq[L(m)]$ for all

$$j\in\{1,2,\ldots,L^*(m)\}.$$

According to equality $L(m)=\frac{2m}{\ln(m)^{\beta\ln(2)}}$ we will get

$$I_2\leq\gamma(m+1)\frac{2m}{\ln(m)^{\beta\ln(2)}}\ln(\ln(\frac{2m}{\ln(m)}))\leq$$

$$\leq C\frac{m^2\ln(\ln(m))}{\ln(m)^{\beta\ln(2)}}=o(m^2\ln(\ln(m)))$$

In the long run $I=I_1+I_2=o(m^2\ln(\ln(m)))$ as $m\to\infty$. The lemma is proved. □

LEMMA **2.5.** *There are $c>0$ and $\beta>0$ such that for all sufficiently large $m\in\mathbb{N}$ it is always possible to select an*

$$s_0\in\{1,2,\ldots,m\}$$

such that

$$\nu_2(k-s_0)\leq\beta\ln(\ln(m))$$

and

$$(s_0+1)\Delta(k-s_0)\geq cm\ln(\ln(m))$$

.

Proof.

DEFINITION **2.8.** *Define*

$$I^*(m,\beta) = \sum_{\{1\le s\le m | \nu_2(k-s)\le \beta \ln(\ln(m))\}} (s+1)\Delta(k-s).$$

So

$$I^*(m,\beta) = A(k) - I(m,\beta)$$

According to lemmas 3 and 4 there exist $c>0$ and $\beta>0$ such that the inequality

$$I^* \ge cm^2 \ln(\ln(m))$$

holds for sufficiently large m. So there is always $s_0 \in \{1,2,\dots,m\}$ such that

$$\nu_2(k-s_0) \le \beta \ln(\ln(m))$$

and

$$(s_0+1)\Delta(k-s_0) \ge cm \ln(\ln(m))$$

for large m. The lemma is proved. □

3 Proof of the theorem 1

In accordance with lemma 4

$$\Delta(k-s_0) \ge \frac{cm\ln(\ln(m))}{s_0+1} \ge \frac{cm\ln(\ln(m))}{m+1} \ge \frac{c}{2}\ln(\ln(m))$$

for sufficiently large m.

If $(k-s_0)$ is odd then we are done, since

$$\tau(p^{k-s_0}+1) \ge \tau(k-s_0) \ge \Delta(k-s_0).$$

Let $k-s_0 = 2^t a$, where a is odd, $t \ge 1$.

Then $a < \frac{k}{2} = \frac{\mu m}{2}$. Let $\beta = \frac{c}{4} > 0$.

Now we have that

$$\Delta(a) = \Delta(k-s_0) - t \ge \frac{c}{2}\ln(\ln(m)) - \beta\ln(\ln(m)) = \frac{c}{4}\ln(\ln(m))$$

when m is large enough.

Consider 3 cases:

CASE 1. *a has a prime factor* $q > 2\mu$.

Proof. In this case $a = q \cdot b$, where b is odd thus $b = \frac{a}{q} < \frac{\mu m}{2q} < \frac{m}{4}$. Hence $\exists$ an odd r such that $rb \in \{(\mu-1)m, (\mu-1)m+1, \ldots, \mu m - 1\}$. Let us take the smallest such r and let s^* satisfies

$$\mu m - s^* = k - s^* = rb$$

, consequently

$$s^* = \mu m - rb \geq \mu m - ((\mu-1)m + 2b) = m - 2b > \frac{m}{2}.$$

By the way

$$\Delta(b) = \Delta(a) - 1 > \frac{c}{8}\ln(\ln(m))$$

(m is sufficiently large). Hence

$$(s^*+1)\Delta(k-s^*) = (s^*+1)\Delta(rb) > s^*\Delta(b) >$$

$$> \frac{m}{2} \cdot \frac{c}{4}\ln(\ln(m)) = \frac{c}{8} m \ln(\ln(m)).$$

We have that

$$k - s^* = rb$$

is odd and so we are done in this case. □

Case 2. *All prime factors of a are less then 2μ.*

Proof. To see what is going on in this case let us write the canonical factorisation of a. Suppose $a = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdot \ldots \cdot p_t^{\alpha_t}$ where p_j is an odd prime less than 2μ and α_j is a positive integer for every $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, t\}$. Assume that $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \ldots \leq \alpha_t$.Thereby

$$\alpha_t \geq \frac{\Delta(a)}{t} \geq \frac{\Delta(a)}{\pi(2\mu)} \geq \frac{c}{4\pi(2\mu)}\ln(\ln(m)).$$

Let us take

$$b = p_t^{\beta_t}$$

and impose the following conditions on it .
1)$b < \frac{m}{4}$
2)$\beta_t \geq \rho \ln(\ln(m))$ for some $\rho > 0$.

To satisfy the first condition it is enough to find β_t from

$$(2\mu)^{\beta_t} < \frac{m}{4},$$

or

$$\beta_t < (log_{2\mu}(\frac{m}{4})),$$

so it is enough to take

$$\beta_t = [\frac{c}{4\pi(2\mu)}\ln(\ln(m))]$$

for large m, to satisfy both conditions. To finish the proof we need only to repeat the last part of solution of case 1. □

Case 3. $a = 1$.

Proof. In this case

$$k - s_0 = 2^t a = 2^t$$

so

$$t \geq log_2((\mu - 1)m) > \beta \ln(\ln(m))$$

for large m, which is a contradiction. Case 3 is proved. □

Notice that we have proved the theorem for

$$k = \mu m$$

only. So we need to prove it in any case.

Proof. Assume that

$$k = \mu m - r$$

for sufficiently large m and

$$r \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \mu - 1\}.$$

Therefore

$$\tau(p^k + p^{s-r}) = \tau(p^{\mu m - r} + p^{s-r}) = \frac{s - r + 1}{s + 1}\tau(p^{\mu m} + p^s).$$

It is evident that we may assume

$$s > 2\mu.$$

Indeed, in the former summation first 2μ summands do not influence upon the sum, since their sum is

$$o(m^2 \ln(\ln(m))).$$

So, if we take an s_0 which maximizes

$$\tau(p^{\mu m} + p^s)$$

we will get that

$$\tau(p^{\mu m - r} + p^{s_0 - r}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\tau(p^{\mu m} + p^{s_0}),$$

since

$$\frac{s - r + 1}{s + 1} \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

for $s > 2\mu$ and $r < \mu$.
Observing that

$$\mu(s_0 - r) \leq \mu m - \mu r < \mu m - r$$

we are done . The theorem is now proved. □

4 Proof of the theorem 2

LEMMA **4.1.** *If $1 \leq \mu < \theta^{-1}$, then there is a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$T_N(\mu) > c\frac{ln(N)}{\tau(N)}$$

for all positive integers N.

Proof. Using the formula

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} \tau(k) = N\ln(N) + (2\gamma - 1)N + O(N^{\theta+\epsilon})$$

we will get that

$$\sum_{k=N+1}^{N+[\sqrt[\mu]{N}]} \tau(k) = (N + \sqrt[\mu]{N})\ln(N + \sqrt[\mu]{N}) + (2\gamma - 1)(N + \sqrt[\mu]{N}) +$$

$$+O((N + \sqrt[\mu]{N})^{\theta+\epsilon}) - (N\ln(N) + (2\gamma - 1)N + O(N^{\theta+\epsilon})) =$$

$$= N^{\frac{1}{\mu}}\ln(N) + O(N^{\frac{1}{\mu}}) + O(N^{\theta+\epsilon}) = N^{\frac{1}{\mu}}\ln(N) + O(N^{\frac{1}{\mu}})$$

, since $\frac{1}{\mu} > \theta$ and $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary. Thus

$$\max_{1\leq m\leq[\sqrt[\mu]{N}]}\{\tau(N+m)\} > \frac{\sum_{k=N+1}^{N+[\sqrt[\mu]{N}]}\tau(k)}{\sqrt[\mu]{N}} =$$

$$= \frac{N^{\frac{1}{\mu}}\ln(N) + O(N^{\frac{1}{\mu}})}{\sqrt[\mu]{N}} > c\ln(N),$$

for some $c > 0$ and any positive integer N.
It follows that

$$T_N(\mu) = \frac{\max_{1\leq m\leq[\sqrt[\mu]{N}]}\{\tau(N+m)\}}{\tau(N)} > c\frac{\ln(N)}{\tau(N)}$$

for all positive integers N. The lemma is proved. □

Now we prove theorem 2.

Proof. Suppose (n_k) is a sequence of positive integers such that $n_k = {p_k}^{j_k}$, where p_k is prime , j_k is a positive integer for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$.

Suppose $E > 0$ is an arbitrary number. According to theorem 1 there is an $A > 0$ such that $j_k > A$ implies $T_{n_k}(\mu) > E$.

Lemma 6 shows that

$$T_{n_k}(\mu) > c\frac{\ln(n_k)}{\tau(n_k)} = c\frac{j_k\ln(p_k)}{j_k + 1} \geq \frac{1}{2}c\ln(p_k)$$

So there is $B > 0$ such that $p_k > B$ implies $T_{n_k}(\mu) > E$.

The condition $n_k \to \infty$ shows that there are only finitely many $k \in N$ with $j_k \leq A$ and $p_k \leq B$. So there is a positive integer $k = k(E)$ such that $T_{n_k}(\mu) > E$ for any positive integer $k > k(E)$.
Since E was arbitrary, we conclude that $T_{n_k}(\mu) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$.
The theorem is proved. □

REMARK **4.1.** *In the end worth mentioning that for every $\mu > 0$ the relation*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} T_n(\mu) = \infty$$

seems to be plausible.

References

[1] K.Chandrasekharan, *Introduction to analytic number theory*, Springer, (1968).

[2] I.M.Vinogradov, *Elements of number theory*, Dover Publ., New York, (2003).

[3] A. A. Buhshtab, *Theory of Numbers* (in russian), Moscow, (1974),

[4] E.Ram Murty, *Problems in analytical number theory*, Springer, 1998.

[5] M.A.Korolev, On Karatsuba's Problem Concerning the Divisor Function $\tau(n)$. *Monatsh. Math.*, 168:3-4 (2012), 403–441.

[6] A. A. Karatsuba, Uniform approximation of the remainder term in the Dirichlet divisor problem, *Math. USSR-Izv.*, 6:3 (1972), 467–475.